<u>REMARKS</u>

The present Amendment amends claims 1 and 6, cancels claims 2 and 7, and leaves claims 3-5 and 8 unchanged. Therefore, the present application has pending claims 1, 3-6 and 8.

<u>35 U.S.C. §103 Rejections</u>

Claims 1-4 and 6-8 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over ZipForm in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0002566 to Gajraj. As indicated above, claims 2 and 7 were canceled. Therefore, this rejection with respect to claims 2 and 7 is rendered moot. With respect to the rejection of the remaining claims 1, 3, 4, 6, and 8, this rejection is traversed for the following reasons. Applicants submit that the features of the present invention, as now more clearly recited in claims 1, 3, 4, 6, and 8, are not taught or suggested by ZipForm or Gajraj, whether taken individually or in combination with each other in the manner suggested by the Examiner. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw this rejection.

Amendments were made to the claims to more clearly describe features of the present invention. Specifically, the claims were amended to more clearly describe that the present invention is directed to an application preparation assisting method and system as recited, for example, in independent claims 1 and 6.

The present invention, as recited in claim 1, and as similarly recited in claim 6, provides an application preparation method and system for assisting in preparing an

6

application for making a document-based application to a public organization. The method includes a step of acquiring information on a worldwide standard that defines contents that should be described in the application. The method also includes acquiring information on a standard unique to each country that is defined in detail in conformity with the worldwide standard, and acquiring information on published applications and examination s unique to each country. Another step of the method includes assisting in the preparation of application documents based on the acquired information on the worldwide standard, information on the standard unique to each country, and information on the published applications and examinations. The method also includes a step of examining the application documents to check whether any of the application documents include and item that violates examination criteria. Another step includes preparing and converting the application documents for a certain country to comply with an application format or examination conditions in the country, such that none of the application documents include any item violating the examination criteria. The prior art does not disclose all these features.

The above described features of the present invention, as now more clearly recited in the claims, are not taught or suggested by any of the references of record. More specifically, the features are not taught or suggested by either ZipForm or Gajraj, whether taken individually or in combination with each other.

ZipForm discloses a system and method for assisting in the preparation of the paperwork associated with a typical real estate transaction. However, there is no

teaching or suggestion in ZipForm of an application preparation assisting method or system as recited in claims 1 and 6.

ZipForm's system and method assists in the preparation of paperwork associated with a typical real estate transaction. The completion of all the paperwork associated with a typical real estate transaction, such as listing and sales contracts, offers and counteroffers, disclosure statements, and countless other important documents, can be an extremely time-consuming task. The ZipForm method and system enables one to speed up the process by sharing data between all documents related to the same transaction. For example, a real estate agent can simply fill out one form and the information is automatically shared with all the forms required to complete a transaction. This system and method allows the agent to spend less time managing paperwork.

In the present invention, as recited in claim 1, and as similarly recited in claim 6, the method includes a step of acquiring information on a worldwide standard that defines contents that should be described in the application. As conceded by the Examiner, ZipForm does not disclose this feature. ZipForm relates to real estate transactions, and the ZipForm program allows the user to increase productivity and eliminate repetition in preparing real estate related forms. ZipForm does not disclose acquiring information on a worldwide standard, defining contents that should be described in the application, as claimed.

Another feature of the present invention includes acquiring information on a standard unique to each country that is defined in detail in conformity with the

worldwide standard, and acquiring information regarding published applications and examinations unique to each country. ZipForm does not disclose this feature. The Examiner concedes that ZipForm does not disclose acquiring information unique to each country, which is defined in detail in conformity with the worldwide standard. However, the Examiner asserts that ZipForm discloses acquiring information relating to published applications and examinations unique to each country. To support the assertion that ZipForm discloses this feature, the Examiner cites page 18 and states "set for form for South Dakota Area and Kokomo Area." First, South Dakota is a state and Kokomo is a city. These are not countries having a worldwide connotation as claimed. Furthermore, page 18 of ZipForm merely shows links to newly added libraries of forms added for the South Dakota Real Estate Commission and the Kokomo Area Association of Realtors. No is not information relating to published applications and examinations unique to each country, but rather are standard real estate forms unique to the South Dakota area and the Kokomo area.

Yet another feature of the present invention, as recited in claim 1 and as similarly recited in claim 6, includes assisting in the preparation of application documents based on the acquired information on the worldwide standard, information on the standard unique to each country, and the information on the published applications and examinations. ZipForm does not disclose this feature, and the Examiner cites no text to support an assertion that ZipForm discloses this feature. As previously discussed, ZipForm does not teach acquiring information on a worldwide standard, information on a worldwide standard that is unique to each

country, or the information on the published applications and examinations unique to each country, in the manner claimed.

The present invention, as recited in claim 1 and as similarly recited in claim 6, also provides a step of examining the application documents to check whether any of the application documents include an item that violates examination criteria. ZipForm does not disclose this feature. Again, the ZipForm program relates to forms prepared and used real estate transactions. These real estate forms, which are not applications documents that are examined, are quite different from the claimed applications documents which are examined to determine whether examination criteria are violated.

Yet another feature of the present invention, as recited in claim 1, and as similarly recited in claim 6, includes a step of preparing and converting the application documents for a certain country to comply with an application format or examination conditions in the country, such that none of the application documents include any item violating the examination criteria. ZipForm does not disclose this feature. ZipForm merely discloses an efficient means for filling forms used in real estate transaction. There is no teaching or suggestion in ZipForm of preparing and converting application documents for a certain country, in the manner claimed in the present invention.

Therefore, ZipForm fails to teach or suggest "acquiring information on a world-wide standard which defines contents that should be described in said application" as recited in claim 1, and as similarly recited in claim 6.

Furthermore, ZipForm fails to teach or suggest "<u>acquiring information on a standard unique to each country which is defined in detail in conformity with said world-wide standard, and information on published applications and examinations unique to each country</u>" as recited in claim 1, and as similarly recited in claim 6.

Even further, ZipForm fails to teach or suggest "<u>assisting to prepare application documents based on said acquired information on the world-wide standard, information on the standard unique to each country, and said information on the published applications and examinations</u>" as recited in claim 1, and as similarly recited in claim 6.

Still even further, ZipForm fails to teach or suggest "<u>examining said application documents to check whether any of said application documents include an item which violates examination criteria</u>" as recited in claim 1, and as similarly recited in claim 6.

Yet even further, ZipForm fails to teach or suggest "<u>preparing and converting the application documents for a certain country to comply with an application format or examination conditions in said country such that none of said application documents does include any item violating said examination criteria</u>" as recited in claim 1, and as similarly recited in claim 6.

The above noted deficiencies of ZipForm are not supplied by any of the other references of record, particularly Gajraj. Therefore, combining the teachings of Gajraj with ZipForm still fails to teach or suggest the features of the present invention as now more clearly recited in the claims.

Gajraj discloses a tool for the transformation of marked-up documents using a base architecture. However, there is no teaching or suggestion in Gajraj of an application preparation assisting method or system as recited in claims 1 and 6.

Gajraj discloses a method of transforming a document and a method of populating a transformation table for transforming elements of a first document. In Gajraj, a first document is marked up according to a first document type definition is transformed into a second document marked up according to a second document type definition. The first document includes at least one element and contains a reference to the first document type definition. The method includes a step of determining from the first document type definition to which class of element an element in the first document belongs. The method also includes a step of determining for that class, at least one corresponding element in the second document type definition. The method further includes a step of including in the second document and instance of the corresponding element or elements. The above steps may be repeated for all elements in the first document. In the disclosed method, a single generic tool can be used for transformation between many different types of documents. It is particularly useful in environments where many and varied types of document type definitions (DTD) are in use, or where applications are tailored to use particular DTDs.

In the present invention, as recited in claim 1, and as similarly recited in claim 6, the method includes a step of acquiring information on a worldwide standard that defines contents that should be described in the application. Gajraj does not

12

disclose this feature. To support the assertion that Gajraj discloses this feature, the Examiner cites paragraph [0004] and states, "Gajraj teaches a generic standard for DTDs called Standard Generalized Markup Language (SGML)." The Examiner further asserts that it would be obvious to combine Gajraj with ZipForm, stating "it is known to one of ordinary skill in the art . . . that Data Interchange Format was one of the world standard formats to transform data from a first document (MS Excel) to a second document (Lotus 123)." However, the disclosure of a world standard format used to transform data from MS Excel to Lotus 123 is quite different from acquiring information on a worldwide standard which defines contents that should be described in an application, as claimed. Gajraj does not relate to applications as in the present invention and further does not acquire information that defines contents to be described in an application, as in the present invention.

Another feature of the present invention includes acquiring information on a standard unique to each country that is defined in detail in conformity with the worldwide standard, and acquiring information regarding published applications and examinations unique to each country. Gajraj does not disclose this feature. To support the assertion that Gajraj teaches acquiring information on a standard unique to each country, which is defined in detail in conformity with the worldwide standard, the Examiner cites paragraph [0014], and states, "transforming a first document marked up according to a first document type definition, into a second document marked up according to second document type definition." However, there is no teaching or suggestion in Gajraj whatsoever of acquiring information on a standard

13

unique to different countries, in the manner claimed. Furthermore, there is no teaching or suggestion in Gajraj of acquiring information on published applications and examinations unique to each country, in the manner claimed.

Yet another feature of the present invention, as recited in claim 1 and as similarly recited in claim 6, includes assisting in the preparation of application documents based on the acquired information on the worldwide standard, information on the standard unique to each country, and the information on the published applications and examinations. Gajraj does not disclose this feature. To support the assertion that Gajraj teaches this feature, the Examiner again cites paragraph [0014], and states, "transforming a first document marked up according to a first document type definition, into a second document marked up according to second document type definition." However, transforming a document from one form to another is not the same as assisting in preparing application documents based on information acquired from a worldwide standard, and information on the standard unique to each country, and the information on the published applications and examinations, as claimed.

The present invention, as recited in claim 1 and as similarly recited in claim 6, also provides a step of examining the application documents to check whether any of the application documents include an item that violates examination criteria. Gajraj does not disclose this feature. Specifically, Gajraj does not disclose examining applications documents the determine whether the applications documents include an item that violates examination criteria, as claimed.

Yet another feature of the present invention, as recited in claim 1, and as similarly recited in claim 6, includes a step of preparing and converting the application documents for a certain country to comply with an application format or examination conditions in the country, such that none of the application documents include any item violating the examination criteria. Gajraj not disclose this feature. As described in paragraph [0014], Gajraj merely discloses transforming a first document into a second document. Gajraj does not teach or suggest preparing and converting applications documents for a certain country to comply with an application format or examination conditions in the country, such that none of the application documents include any item violating the examination criteria, in the manner claimed.

Therefore, Gajraj fails to teach or suggest "acquiring information on a world-wide standard which defines contents that should be described in said application" as recited in claim 1, and as similarly recited in claim 6.

Furthermore, Gajraj fails to teach or suggest "acquiring information on a standard unique to each country which is defined in detail in conformity with said world-wide standard, and information on published applications and examinations unique to each country" as recited in claim 1, and as similarly recited in claim 6.

Even further, Gajraj fails to teach or suggest "assisting to prepare application documents based on said acquired information on the world-wide standard, information on the standard unique to each country, and said information on the

published applications and examinations" as recited in claim 1, and as similarly recited in claim 6.

Still even further, Gajraj fails to teach or suggest "examining said application documents to check whether any of said application documents include an item which violates examination criteria" as recited in claim 1, and as similarly recited in claim 6.

Yet even further, Gajraj fails to teach or suggest "preparing and converting the application documents for a certain country to comply with an application format or examination conditions in said country such that none of said application documents does include any item violating said examination criteria" as recited in claim 1, and as similarly recited in claim 6.

Claims 3 and 4 are dependent on claim 1 and claim 8 is dependent on claim 6. Therefore, Applicants submit that claims 3, 4 and 8 are allowable for at least the reasons previously discussed regarding independent claims 1 and 6.

Both ZipForm and Gajraj suffer from the same deficiencies relative to the features of the present invention as recited in the claims. Therefore, combining the teachings of Gajraj with ZipForm in the manner suggested by the Examiner does not render obvious the features of the present invention as now more clearly recited in claims 1, 3, 4, 6, and 8. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection of claims 1, 3, 4, 6, and 8 as being unpatentable over ZipForm in view of Gajraj are respectfully requested.

The remaining references of record have been studied. Applicants submit that they do not supply any of the deficiencies noted above with respect to the references used in the rejection of claims 1, 3, 4, 6, and 8.

Claim 5 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over ZipForm in view of Gajraj, further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,557,515 to Abbruzzese, et al. ("Abbruzzese"). Claim 5 is dependent on claim 1. Therefore, Applicants submit that claim 5 is allowable for at least the reasons previously discussed regarding independent claim 1.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants submit that claims 1, 3-6 and 8 are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, early allowance of such claims is respectfully requested.

To the extent necessary, Applicants petition for an extension of time under 37 CFR 1.136. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, or credit any overpayment of fees, to the deposit account of Mattingly, Stanger, Malur & Brundidge, P.C., Deposit Account No. 50-1417 (referencing attorney docket no. 500.41210X00).

Respectfully submitted,

MATTINGLY, STANGER, MALUR & BRUNDIDGE, P.C.

Donna K. Mason
Registration No. 45,962

DKM/sdb
(703) 684-1120

17